

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the *Office Action* dated October 2, 2007. At the time of the *Office Action*, Claims 1-26 were pending, of which, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-26. Applicant has amended Claims 1-3, 9, 10, and 16-18, and has added Claims 27-34. Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 9, and 16 may be found, for example, on pages 3, 4, and 7 of the Application. Support for the amendments to Claims 2, 3, 10, 17, and 18 may be found, for example, on page 9 of the Application. Support for new Claims 27-29 may be found, for example, on page 8 of the Application. Support for new Claims 30-32 may be found for example on pages 3-4 of the Application and support for new Claim 33 may be found, for example, on page 9 of the Application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103(a)

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-5, 9, 11 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,623,600 to Ji et al. (“*Ji*”). The Examiner further rejects Claims 10, 15, and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ji*. The Examiner further rejects claims 6-8, 12-14, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ji* in view of US Patent No. 7,080,000 to Cambridge (“*Cambridge*”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the reasons stated below.

Claims 34 includes the limitations, “comparing a length of a URL in a message header of the incoming message with the predefined length in the signature file to determine whether the incoming message is malicious.” Similar to Claim 34, Claims 27-29 each include similar limitations. Applicant respectfully contends that neither *Ji* nor *Cambridge*, alone or in combination, teach, disclose, or suggest these limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully contends that Claims 27-29 and 34 are in condition for allowance.

Additionally, Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a method for maintaining computer security. As part of the method, “an incoming message [is received] from the at least one client computer, wherein the incoming message, if malicious and upon receipt by the web server, automatically causes the web server to perform an action which exploits a vulnerability of the web server.” Claims 9 and 16 each include similar limitations. Applicant

respectfully contends that neither *Ji* nor *Cambridge*, alone or in combination, teach, disclose, or suggest these limitations.

For instance, *Ji* is directed to, “a File Transfer Protocol (FTP) proxy server, for controlling the transfer of files and a Simple Mail Transfer Protocol (SMTP) proxy server for controlling the transfer of mail messages through the system” See *Ji*, abstract. Applicant respectfully contends that neither a FTP file transfer nor an SMTP mail message transfer discloses an “incoming message [that] if malicious and upon receipt by the web server, automatically causes the web server to perform an action which exploits a vulnerability of the web server” as required by Claim 1. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 and its dependent claims, and for similar reasons, to withdraw the rejections of Claims 9 and 16 and their respective dependent claims.

Furthermore, Claim 33 is directed to the method of Claim 1 wherein, “the incoming message is received from a first client computer [and] if the incoming message is determined to be malicious, identifying the first computer and automatically blocking future messages received from the first client computer.” Applicant respectfully contends that neither *Ji* nor *Cambridge* alone or in combination teach disclose or suggest these limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully contends that Claims 33 is in condition for allowance.

For at least the reasons explained above and for other apparent reasons, Applicant respectfully contends that all claims are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending Claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicant stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

Applicant hereby takes an extension of time to accompany this RCE for one month from **January 2, 2008 to February 2, 2008**.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the **\$810.00 RCE fee**, the **\$120.00 Extension of Time fee**, **\$350.00** for the addition of seven dependent claims, **\$210** for the addition of one independent claim, and to the extent necessary, charge any additional required fees or credit any overpayments to **Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.**

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant



Luke K. Pedersen
Reg. No. 45,003

Date: 2/4/08

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer No. **05073**